	Case 2:23-cv-00764-DAD-DMC Docum	ent 8 Filed 08/10/23 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JORGE H. ARCE-CASTRO,	No. 2:23-cv-00764-DAD-DMC (HC)
12	Petitioner,	
13	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
14	WARDEN,	RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING HABEAS PETITION DUE TO
15	Respondent.	PETITIONER'S FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDERS
16		(Doc. No. 7)
17		
18	Petitioner Donavon Nordstrom is a federal prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> with a petition for	
19	writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The matter was referred to a United States	
20	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
21	On June 15, 2023, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations	
22	recommending that this action be dismissed, without prejudice, due to petitioner's failure to	
23	comply with court orders and failure to prosecute this action. (Doc. No. 7.) The findings and	
24	recommendations were served upon petitioner and contained notice that any objections thereto	
25	were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (Id. at 2.) To date, petitioner has not	
26	filed any objections and the time in which to do so has passed.	
27	/////	
28	/////	
		1

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the pending findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations issued on June 15, 2023 (Doc. No. 7) are adopted in full; 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. No. 1) is dismissed, without prejudice; 1 and 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **August 9, 2023** Because petitioner is a federal prisoner bringing a § 2241 petition, a certificate of appealability is not required. See Harrison v. Ollison, 519 F.3d 952, 958 (9th Cir. 2008) ("The plain language of [28 U.S.C.] § 2253(c)(1) does not require a petitioner to obtain a COA in order to appeal the

denial of a § 2241 petition.").